

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

LESTER KRUPP, )  
                    )  
Plaintiff,        )  
                    )  
vs.                )                   Case No. 4:07-CV-883 (JCH)  
                    )  
ST. LOUIS JUSTICE CENTER, et al.,    )  
                    )  
Defendants.       )

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

The matter is before the Court on various motions filed by Plaintiff and Defendant. The Court will address each in turn.

On December 5, 2007, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 126) asserting that Plaintiff's claims should be dismissed because he has failed to comply with the Case Management Order ("CMO") (Doc. No. 70). On December 17, 2007, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting more time to answer discovery requests. (Doc. No. 142). Upon consideration, the Court will deny Defendant's motion to dismiss, but it will require Plaintiff to turn over the discovery, which was originally due on November 19, 2007 in the CMO, to Defendants no later than Friday, January 11, 2007. The Court emphasizes that this is a strict deadline. The Court will dismiss Plaintiff's case with prejudice if this new deadline is not met.

On December 11, 2007, Plaintiff filed his "Motion for Leave of Court for Production of Documents from Samuel Simon and Jerome Fields." (Doc. No. 134). Specifically, Plaintiff wants copies of his grievance documents from these individuals. Upon consideration, this request is denied. Plaintiff should request these documents from the named defendants.

On December 14, 2007, Plaintiff filed his “Motion to have Brock and Burt Served by the US (sic) Marshalls.” (Doc. No. 137). In this document, he asks for the Court to issue process for defendants Brock and Burt and for the Court to order the United States Marshals to effectuate service. Upon consideration, the Court will order the clerk to issue process for these individuals, but will not order the United States Marshals to effectuate service.

On December 17, 2007, Plaintiff filed his “Motion for Exceptional Circumstances to Modify the Current Case Management Order.” (Doc. No. 140). Specifically, Plaintiff wants the Court to extend the discovery deadline until January 24, 2008. The Court will grant this request, as discovery was supposed to close on January 18, 2008.

On December 18, 2007, Plaintiff filed his “Motion to Subpoena Insurance Carriers.” (Doc. No. 143). Defendants’ Response notes that Plaintiff has received a copy of the applicable portions of its insurance policy. (Doc. No. 145). As such, the Court will deny this request.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 126) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave of Court for Production of Documents (Doc. No. 134) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion to have Brock and Burt Served by US Marshalls (Doc. No. 137) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part. The Clerk shall issue process for Defendants Unknown Brock and Unknown Burt.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Exceptional Circumstances to Modify Current Case Management Order (Doc. No. 140) is **GRANTED** and the discovery deadline is now **Thursday, January 24, 2008**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time (Doc. No. 142) is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff has until **Friday, January 11, 2008** to answer Plaintiff's discovery requests.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Subpoena Insurance Carriers (Doc. No. 143) is **DENIED**.

Dated this 3rd day of January, 2008.

/s/ Jean C. Hamilton  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE